DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 266 663 FL 015 509

AUTHOR Paulston, Christina Bratt
TITLE Communicative Competence and Language Teaching: Second Thoughts.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 19p.; In: Communicative Language Teaching. Selected Papers from the RELC Seminar (Singapore, April 23-27, 1984). Anthology Series 14 (FL 015 507).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Techniques; *Communicative Competence (Languages); *Cultural Context; Definitions; Educational Strategies; English (Second Language); *Language Usage; Linguistic Theory; Second Language Instruction; Sociolinguistics; *Speech Acts; Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Discussions of the communicative approach to language teaching are often confusing because different definitions are ascribed to communicative competence in the teaching context. Its definition as the appropriate use of the sociocultural rules for language use in spontaneous interaction is preferred; this definition makes possible more precise testing of communicative proficiency. An ethnographic study of features of effective classroom activities in bilingual education has these implications for the communicative approach and instruction in English as a second language: (1) good teachers do make a difference; (2) methods and materials are not as important as meaningful and interesting activities, on-task focus, clear activity objectives, and comprehensible feedback; (3) to the degree that teachers can incorporate these principles in their classroom activities, students should learn English. It seems, moreover, that communicative language teaching by its nature already does, or easily can, incorporate all of these features. Whether or not the communicative approach is adopted, an approach to language teaching that incorporates genuine communication in the classroom is desirable. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mathan L. Tucker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Communicative Competence and Language Teaching: Second Thoughts

CHRISTINA BRATT PAULSTON

ED266663

Introduction and Background

It is frequently commented that it takes some twenty years for new academic concepts and insights to become commonplace in the teaching of our public schools. That is also the case with the notion of communicative competence and language teaching. Twenty years ago, in 1964, Gumperz and Hymes edited a special issue of the *American Anthropologist* with the title of "The Ethnography of Communication" (Gumperz and Hymes, 1964). This publication was the basis of their later *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (1972) of which "the theoretical goal ... is best illustrated by the notion of communicative competence: what a speaker needs to know to communicate effectively in culturally significant settings" (Gumperz and Hymes, 1972: vii). Ten years ago I wrote an article "Linguistic and Communicative Competence" (1974) which I believe was the first attempt to work out the implications for language teaching from Dell Hymes' notion of communicative competence (1972). The time has come to take stock.

The concern for communicative language teaching surfaced on both sides of the Atlantic as early as the late sixties (Oller and Obrecht, 1968; Jakobovits, 1969; Rutherford, 1968; Wardhaugh, 1969; etc.) Partially it was a reaction against the mechancial nature and boring activity of drills in the audio-lingual method, but communicative competence was also a counter-concept to Chomsky's (1957) notion of competence in theoretical linguistics. In my own work, I joined an insistence on using language at least some of the time for communicative purposes (1970), with, later, a rationale firmly based on Hymes' communicative comptence (1974).

What do we mean by communicative competence in language teaching? People mean two different things with it, and it is often confusing because it is not clear which definition they have in mind.

FL 015509

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rivers (1973) and those who work with foreign language teaching in the United States tend to define communicative competence as simply linguistic interaction in the target language: "the ability to function in a truly communicative setting; that is, in a spontaneous transaction involving one or more other persons" (Savignon, 1978: 12). People who work in ESL, on the other hand, tend to use communicative competence in Hymes' sense to include not only the linguistic forms of the language but also its social rules, the knowledge of when, how, and to whom it is appropriate to use these forms. In the latter view, the objectives of language teaching are held to include the socio-cultural rules for language use, not as an added cultural component, but as an integral part of the language taught. To wit, there are rules in American Engligh not only for forming grammatically correct wh-questions but also for the topic of questions which are admissable and socially appropriate. A Japanese banker some years ago when I was promoted to associate professor asked me how old I was to be so promoted. I simply did not answer his question because I thought it was both inappropriate and inadmissable. I told him instead that age had nothing to do with it which he, in his turn, found a very peculiar remark.

Finally, in addition to these two common definitions of communicative competence in language teaching, for purposes of research, Canale and Swain (1979, 1980) in their review of the literature on communicative competence suggest three subcomponents: grammatical, discourse, and sociolinguistic competence which together make up communicative competence. Grammatical competence is just that, a knowledge of lexical items and the rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and phonology (1979: 54). Discourse competence is "defined as the ability to produce and recognize coherent and cohesive text (1983: 5)", while sociolinguistic competence is "defined as the ability to produce and recognize socially appropriate language within a given sociocultural context (1983: 9), i.e., Hymes' social rules of language use. This tripartite definition makes possible a more precise testing in the proficiency of communicative competence.

The title of this conference *Communicative Language Teaching* (CLT) wisely begs the question and allows whatever definition you choose to work with. That choice is important and will to a considerable degree decide goals and objectives as well as syllabi and

curriculum of language teaching. In the remainder of this paper I will use communicative competence as I have always done to refer to the anthropological sense of socio-cultural rules for language use and use CLT primarily to refer to spontaneous oral interaction in general.

Methods and Language Teaching

Now, there is very little new in language teaching as a quick perusal of Kelly's *25 Centuries of Language Teaching* will attest to. St. Augustine introduced the use of "dialogs", these were pattern drills in the Middle Ages; the scholatics taught patterns of politeness and rudeness in a sort of notional/functional approach (only, of course, they didn't call it that), grammar-translation goes back to the Greeks and before. Even the Hittites 2000 BC did grammar translation. There is a limit on what a teacher can do to a class; there are just so many activities students can undertake in a classroom, and with the exception of new technological advances, there is very little new at the technique level. (Except, maybe, the Silent Way.)

What does change is the combination and constellation of techniques into methods as well as all the theories that attempt to account for them. The fact of the matter is that we really don't know how to account for language acquisition, and so we have a lot of theories which come and go. We also have some remarkable methods at present and you can make the case that communicative language teaching is a method. How do we take stock?[1]

Jack Richards (1983) in his plenary TESOL address "The Secret Life of Methods" points out that facts have very little to do with the evaluation of methods:

> This rarely followed option involves empirical demonstration of the validity of a method's claims, for example, through documented research which demonstrates precisely what learners achieve as a result of instruction. This route is difficult to carry out, and since its findings may not necessarily be the ones we hoped for, there is not a single serious piece of research published to demonstrate precisely what learners learn from a Notional syllabus, from Communicative Language Teaching, Silent Way, or most of the other methods which countless journal articles advocate with such enthusiasm (Richards, 1983: 11).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Richards is right, with one exception, that we really have no data as to teaching efficacy to support all the enthusiastic claims of this spate of new sometimes called humanistic methods. The exception is communicative language teaching. As early as 1968, Oller and Obrecht (1968) concluded from an experimental study that communicative activity should be a central point of pattern drills from the very first stages of language learning. Savignon's widely cited dissertation in 1971 confirmed beyond doubt that language learning which used language for purpose of communication, for getting messages across, was a more efficient process of learning than the audiolingual type pattern drills. But Richards is right that we don't know how communicative language teaching compares with any of the other recent methods on the basis of facts. It seems inconceivable to me that some of these new methods would be a more efficient way of teaching language but there are no data to prove it one way or the other.

So stock taking in a scientific fashion based on hard data from experimental comparisons becomes impossible. How then can I make a judgment? Basically, I can know in two ways acceptable to academics: through pratical experience and empirical evidence or through theoretical speculations or knowledge of others' theory and model building, the linking of constructs into propositions and interrelated hypotheses. Teachers have in time honored fashion through trial-and-error sorted out in their classroom what will and will not work, even though they do not necessarily know why and how it works. It is an empiricism, born of the necessity of the teaching situation, which is basically divorced from theory. As such, it has very little prestige in Academia. Prestige lies with theoretical speculations of the kind which allows me to reason e.g., that the importance of the role which we assign these days to input in the language acquisition process will argue against a method which limits the teacher's utterance of a new word to one occurrance as it does in the Silent Way. Preferably you want your theory to explain your empirical data, but if I had to choose one or the other — and I am now only talking about language teaching and learning of which we know so very little — I would prefer the judgement of common sense classroom teachers to that of theoretical speculations. Ignoring teacher judgements can be an expensive proposition.

Current theories of language acquisition very much support communicative activities in the classroom but there are no learning

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

theories which can be stretched to motivate communicative competence in Hymes' sense. The theories for the latter come from anthropology and support *what* should be taught, not *how*. Since we can draw on neither learning theories nor empirical evidence, we are reduced to practical experience and common sense in making our claims and judgement about communicative competence in language teaching, no more, no less.

I want to conclude this section of my paper with two comments on methods in general. One is that methods probably are not very important in accounting for language learning results. Given the social setting and the super/subordinate relationship between ethnic groups which contribute to one learning the other's language, given what it takes to provide opportunity and motivation, it is very unlikely that methods will play any greater importance. That is probably another reason[2] why it is so difficult to get conclusive evidence in experimental design research comparing various methods. As Lennart Levin concluded, tongue-in-cheek, after a major Swedish study "All methods are best" (1969).

The other comment is to explain the at times puzzling popularity of many of the new methods. You can with Kuhn (1971) talk of paradigm shift in the sciences and sketch the anatomy of the Chomskyan revolution which did have a great influence in toppling the audiolingual school of thought, or you can simply talk of fashions in language teaching which like our skirts go up and down. Skirt lengths have nothing to do with common sense and Suggestopedia is in vogue.[3] Nor does it have anything to do with common sense.

Second Thoughts

Where does all this leave us with language teaching and communicative competence? I do indeed have second thoughts. I regret to say that I think we have gone too far, and that the swing of the pendulum of high fashion has carried us off the Middle Road of good judgement and common sense. I have three reasons for this concern.

The first two reasons both have to do with the material to be taught, with the specific teaching points. I am not here really concerned with whether the syllabus should be organized according to a structural/linguistic content or according to functions and speech acts, although that is a very important matter that has never been

satisfactorily worked out.[4]

The problem lies with the basic description of speech acts and the rules for their usage. The ten years since I wrote "Linguistic and Communicative Competence" I have partly spent directing and supervising M.A. theses on speech acts and the teaching of English. If native speakers after two years of intense study of theoretical and applied linguistics and sociolinguistics not only do not themselves know these rules but also find immense difficulties in ascertaining and describing them, maybe we should be a little more careful than I was ten years ago in globally prescribing a communicative competence approach in language teaching.

The difficulty of description does not basically lie at the theoretical level. Hymes' framework is holding up very well and further work, like Brown and Levinson (1978) add useful support.

The difficulty lies partially in the difficulty of observation and collection of data and in the selection of variables which influence language manifestations. Labov's paradox of how you observe unobserved behavior is of concern here. At present a student of mine is studying rejoinders to *thank you*. Degree of formality is likely to be a variable and she can in all likelihood collect data in situations where setting will trigger register, like court and church. But social class is also likely to be a variable and she simply will not be able to unobstrusively observe in-group upper class behaviour in Pittsburgh. This is not the place to discuss how you deal with such problems but they are very real and very much there.

Another difficulty lies with the variability of the communicative competence rules. The range of rejoinders to *thank you* surprises me, not just the American *you are welcome* (dialectical variation) but *ah ha* and *OK* (generational variation?), the latter which I would until recently have denied as native usage. In order to teach communicative competence, core norms, which are hard to find, must be captured and given a significant generalization. What happens very often is that teachers disagree with the rules in the text, refuse to teach them and criticize the text, a situation which is very confusing to the students. Teaching communicative competence is not as simple as we once thought.

The second reason for my concern about teaching English for communicative competence in a city like Singapore is the problem of whose rules. In Pittsburgh that is easy. Our students in the English

Language Institute do need to learn general American rules for using language in interaction and negotiating meaning in socially appropriate ways. Our Latin American students need not only to know the phrase for *thank you* but also that they shouldn't repeat it ten times because then they sound insincere in English, and our Japanese students will have to learn to turn down requests from superiors. A while back I wanted to change an appointment with a doctoral student who happened to be Japanese, asked if she could come right after class instead of 2 p.m. as we had planned, she said yes and came. Months later in a report to our sociolinguistic class, she treated this episode as data, went on to relate that she had had a luncheon date with a friend waiting on a street corner, but Japanese rules made it impossible for her to say no to me. (Luckily the friend was Japanese too and understood why she was stood up). I, of course would never even think it noticeable if she had told me that she had another appointment. The point of this anecdote is that living in a specific culture, your life can become unnecessarily complicated without attention to the communicative competence rules of language.

When I lived in Lima and made an appointment with a Peruvian, I always said "Your rules or mine?" so I would know whether to be on time or late. They always understood what I meant and themselves routinely used the expressions *hora latina*, *hora gringa* "latin time, foreign time" for clarification. The point here is that one set of rules was not perceived as better than another, it was simply a practical matter of clearing noise in the channel, of functioning with the same rules.

But for a Swede being on time[5] is not just a practical concern but one of moral implications. To be late is to show moral weakness, and so it is with many of the communicative competence rules that they don't only signal social meaning but that they also reflect the values and belief system of the culture in which they are operative. My Japanese student's inability to say no to me was not just a question of quaint etiquette but is solidly founded on Japanese worldview and value system. .

Now maybe you are beginning to see my concern. To insist in Singapore that speakers behave with English in a way that is culturally appropriate in the United States and which reflects American values is just plain silly. In the first place, there are perfectly

legitimate — and different — British and Australian ways of using English that cannot just be ignored. In the second place, English is an official language in Singapore, and as Braj Kachru has argued for years for Indian English, Singaporean English has a right to its own life, to its own local communicative competence. To argue anything else sounds to me very much like cultural imperialism, and I hope nobody took seriously the article of mine which RELC published a few years ago (1979). I recant. I think now that English belongs every bit as much to those who use it as a lingua franca, as a language of wider communication (LCW), as it does to the English-speaking peoples. The use of English in Singapore is an economic and political statement of citizens of the free world, not a cultural orientation toward Britain or the United States.

In the third place, it is silly because it is unrealistic. Asian culture is enormously tenacious, and even if every USIS and British Council member descended on Singapore to preach the virtues of a communicative competence approach in ESL, I doubt that it would make any difference. People in Singapore — and India and Nigeria and Hong Kong — will go on speaking English with the communicative competence rules of their native tongue,[6] and I think we should accept that fact as a positive state of affairs.

Finally, my third reason for concern applies to all communicative language teaching, not just to matters of communicative competence. It concerns teacher competencies. As Richards and Rodgers (1981) discuss in an excellent article on methods of language teaching, different methods require different roles of teachers and students. In the audiolingual method, the teacher controlled all activities, and closely tied to his textbook, he conducted the orchestra of his class. Breen and Candlin discuss the role of the teacher in a communicative approach which is to facilitate communication and act as independent participant:

> These roles imply a set of secondary roles for the teacher; first, as an organizer of resources and as a resource himself, second, as a guide within the classroom procedures and activities...A third role for the teacher is that of researcher and learner, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge and abilities, actual and observed experience of the nature of learning, and organizational capacities (1980:99).

In short, what communicative language teaching requires (much as the Direct Method did before it) in order to be effective is teachers with near-native competence in English. It is all very well to have communicative language teaching be the rage in Britain and the United States where the teachers are native speakers of English but quite another matter to export it to parts of the world which routinely use non-native speakers in English. I don't know how many of you have ever taught a language you knew imperfectly but I remember vividly teaching French in Pine Island, Minnesota. The textbook was my lifeline and I certainly did not encourage student questions about vocabulary items as the likelihood that I wouldn't know the answer was high. It is just plain scary for teachers to be in front of a class and not know what they are teaching. Add to the requirement of teacher fluency in the target language, cultural values (Furey, 1980) of saving face and the position of teachers in the social hierarchy, (i.e. teachers command high respect and it is difficult for them to admit to ignorance), and it seems to me that a great deal of caution is needed in adopting a communicative approach in ESL in Southeast Asia. A demoralized teacher corps is not conducive to effective language teaching.

Effective Classroom Techniques

I suggested earlier that methods are not very important, so maybe a method of communicative language teaching does not make much difference. But I do think that techniques and procedures in language teaching *are* important, that classroom activities and how they are conducted *will* influence learning. I say that methods are not important because there is no one to one relationship between method and techniques. For instance, dialogs in language teaching have been around since St. Augustine's days and have been used in different methods for different purposes.

What I would like to do at this point is to examine some features of effective classroom activities from an unusual ethnographic descriptive study of bilingual education. I want to do this in order to see how many of these features we find in communicative language learning. The Significant Bilingual Instructional Features (SBIF) study is a three-year study, funded by the (U.S.) National Institute of Education, and just completed. The intent of the study is "to provide important information that will increase understanding

of bilingual instruction, and subsequently increase opportunities for students with limited or no proficiency in English to participate fully and successfully in the educational process" (Tikunoff, 1983:v). It will eventually become available though ERIC, but in the meantime I would like to share some of the findings and their implications for ESL and communicative language teaching as I think it is an important study.

In contrast to all the experimental-design, psychometric studies of language teaching methods, this study identified successful teachers[7] and then observed their fifty-eight classrooms for significant instructional features[8]. Five features were found to be significant and they all have to do with teaching behaviors rather than curriculum or materials. (See Appendix.) "Regardless of variation in programmes, curriculum and materials, school district policies, philosophies of instruction, and ethnolinguistic groups, the teachers in the sample exhibited all five features frequently and consistently" (Tikunoff, 1983:6). It may be fashionable to minimize the teacher's role in the classroom, but I think it is a serious mistake. The SBIF study documents beyond any reasonable doubt the importance of teacher behavior, not of methods and materials but of classroom procedures and activities.

In discussing the SBIF findings, I will extrapolate those features which relate to language learning. The SBIF study was concerned with successful learning in general.

In reading through the fifteen documents of the study, my strongest impression was that *the* most important teaching characteristic is efficient classroom management. I think most of us would agree that one of the teacher's major roles is to structure the school environment so that the students can learn, which is what good classroom management does. Good teaching allows for both learning and acquisition.[9] Learning would include activities which focused on form, such as reading aloud in English with the focus on sound-symbol relationship, working with vocabulary cards, copying sentences where the right word had to be filled in (these activities are taken from the SBIF study), while acquisition presumably takes place during activities where the focus is on the content or function of language, such as free compositions, role plays, and interaction activities. The acquisition process is in fact the major theoretical rationale for a communicative approach, and the evidence is quite clear that without a stage of language use for communication, language teaching is not very efficient (Savignon, 1971; Swain, 1983). It is the

teacher's job to arrange for both types of activities in the classroom.

Good teachers make very clear what tasks and exercises they set and what the students must do to accomplish these tasks. They were careful to explain, outline, summarize and review. The teachers also gave a lot of attention to vocabulary work. In second language acquisition, learners probably focus on vocabulary and then work out the semantic relationship between lexical items (and the grammar) from their pragmatic knowledge of the real world. In any case, it is clear from the SBIF study that good teachers spend a lot of energy, their own and students', on vocabulary development. The easiest way for a student to understand the meaning of a new word in the L2 is through translation to his mother tongue, and the SBIF teachers routinely used the children's mother tongue if they got lost or confused. Half the time this was to individual students and it was a reiteration or translation of what they had not understood in English the first time. Clearly the ESL teacher needs to exercise judgment here. We certainly don't want long linguistic lectures in the L1 but on the other hand we don't want long linguistic lectures in English either. If a gloss or two or a brief sentence in the L1 would save time and clarify, then I think it is justified. If some students get lost during a roleplay, then a quick sotto voce L1 explanation might be helpful. What is perfectly clear is that the students must understand what is going on.

They must also work. The SBIF study measured Academic Learning Time (ALT), the time a student is productively engaged in completing assigned tasks at a relatively high rate of accuracy. These students were productively engaged for as much as 82 per cent of the time, which is amazingly high in that it only allows the teacher 18 per cent of the time for instruction, explanations, directions, etc. The most common fault of language teachers is teacher talk. The most appealing aspect of communicative language teaching is that the very method dictates against teacher talk. (And I have also had teachers who say that they don't like to do role plays with their class because it leaves them out, they are not center of the stage any more.) But whatever the method, it is the students who need to process language, not the teacher. Swain argues convincingly in a recent paper that comprehensible output is as necessary a source for grammatical acquisition as is comprehensible input (1983). Good language teachers keep their students working hard on tasks they understand and which are intrinsically interesting to them.

Now the truth of the matter is that most normal people don't find language learning tasks very interesting. One of the advantages of communicative language teaching is that many of the classroom

activities are a lot more interesting than grammar drills and fill-in-the-slot exercises so that whether or not the students learn any more, motivation and attention remain higher. But any activity done too long or too often will stale and that is every bit as true of role plays as of dialogs. The answer lies with a multiple of activities and a change of pace. Keeping students working hard and willingly on task is very much the art of teaching but it also takes careful planning and structure.

Good teachers also make sure that students know what constitutes successful performance so that they know when they are achieving success or they are given access to information about how to achieve success. ALT specifies a high degree of accuracy and the SBIF findings are the "students who are reponding incorrectly to a task need immediate feedback concerning those responses" (Tikunoff, 1983b, 12). This is true for reading and mathematics, but linguists see errors as an inevitable by-product of second language acquisition. This leaves the question of what teachers are supposed to do with errors in the classroom.

One argument is immediate feedback and correction, as the study findings suggest. The opposite is argued by Terrell (1981) who claims that students will learn only if they feel secure affectively and that therefore error correction is ineffectual and tension creating and that students should be left alone to experiment creatively with the second language. There are no experimental data on the role of error correction in L2 acquisition in bilingual education so once again the ESL teacher has to make decisions based on judgment rather than fact.

The guidelines we use for correction in the English Language Institute are the following: If the error is directly part of the teaching point, whether formal like the pronunciation of plurals of functional like the use of present habitual or present progressive, it is helpful in clarifying input to provide immediate feedback and correction. I don't believe that error correction needs to be tension creating; errors and correction are part of school life. But when errors occur incidentally to what is being taught, and they don't interfere with communication or classroom procedures, then I think they are not very important and can be safely ignored. As usual, tact and common sense will tell us more about error correction than research will at the present.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings from the SBIF study make the fol-

lowing reflections seem feasible. Good teachers do make a difference. Methods and materials[10] are not as important as principles of meaningful and interesting activities, on-task focus, clear activity objectives and comprehensible feedback. To the degree that teachers can incorporate these principles in their classroom activities, their students should learn English, but it seems that communicative language teaching by its nature already does or easily can incorporate all of these features. A communicative competence approach to language teaching in Singapore may not be very sensible, but hopefully an approach to language teaching which incorporates genuine communication in the classroom will prove to be more than a fad.

NOTES

1. I don't want to get side tracked into discussing methods but it is clear that different methods do different things: the notional/functional syllabus specifies the teaching points but with no word about HOW to teach them; community counselling learning modifies the role of relationship between teacher and student into counselor and client but leaves syllabus unspecified; grammar/translation specified both teaching points and activities but never dealt with how the teacher would get that mass of linguistic information (often faulty) across to the students. The audiolingual method was rare in its attention to all aspects of language teaching: syllabus, teacher behaviour, student behaviour, classroom activities, linguistic description, and indeed what went on in the heads of the students.

   Communicative language teaching as a method specifies the nature of the classroom interaction/activities and sometimes the teaching points (primarily in the units of speech acts) (e.g., Munby, 1978).

   Francis Johnson points out that since methods in fact attempt different things, it is frequently misleading to compare methods. His point is that a method which has its main objective helping children learn language acquisition strategies should not be compared with a method whose objective is the memorization of vocabulary and grammar rules, using the same criteria of evaluation (personal communication, April, 1984). I quite agree.
2. The first being that methods do different things and are therefore difficult to compare on the same results.
3. The reasons for that vogue is another matter. The need for new dissertation topics and tenure is one probable reason. I suspect teachers just plain get bored doing the same thing year in and year out, i.e., classroom experimentation as a way of self renewal.
4. My own preference for adult learners is for a syllabus organized according to a structural/linguistic content, where the criteria for selection and sequencing of patterns derive from functions firmly grounded in situations which are based on a needs assessment where possible.
5. More than five minutes past the appointed time is beginning to be late. Since such

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

split second timing is difficult in the modern world, Swedes often arrive early and walk around the block so that they can enter at the exact time.

6. Or some combination of rules of local languages.
7. The teachers were nominated as successful by principals, teachers, and parents.
8. "To be significant, an instructional feature had to meet four criteria. First, it has to be relevant in the research literature in terms of positive instructional consequences for LEP students. Second, it had to have occurred frequently and to a high degree in the classes. Third, it must have been identified by teachers in the sample during their analysis of their own instruction as being significant....Fourth, during analysis, features or clusters of features had to be associated with desirable consequences for LEP students" (Tikunoff, 1983:6).
9. Learning is the result of teaching while acquisition results from the student's processing of meaningful language input. (Krashen, 1981). Many believe that without the opportunity for acquisition, a second language is not likely to be mastered.
10. This is only true for excellent teachers who have native-like fluency in the target language. Teachers with less than native-like fluency tend to rely heavily on their textbooks.

REFERENCES

Asher, J. "The Total Physical Response Approach to Second Language Learning," *Modern Language Learning* 53, no. 1 (1969): 3–17.

Asher, J. J. and Adamski, C. *Learning Another Language Through Actions: The Complete Teacher's Guidebook*. Los Gatos, Calif.: Sky Oak Publications, 1977.

Austin, J. L. *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Bancroft, W. J. "The Lozanov Method and Its American Adaptations," *Modern Language Journal* 62, no. 4 (1978): 167–74.

Brown, P. and S. Levinson. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena." In Goody, Esther N., ed., *Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978

Canale, M. and M. Swain. *Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing*. Review and Evaluation Bulletins. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1979.

_____. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing," *Applied Linguistics* 1:1 (1980): 1–47.

Carrell, P. and G. Konneker. "Politeness: Comparing Native and Non-native Judgments," *Language Learning* 31 (1981): 17–30.

_____. "Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching," *TESOL Quarterly* 5:2 (1971): 101–114.

_____. "Learning Theory for the Classroom Teacher," *The Challenge of Communication*, ed. G.A. Jarvis. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co. 142–145, 1974.

Chomsky, N. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.

_____. "Linguistic Theory," *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts*. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1966.

Curran, Charles A. *Counselling-Learning in Second Languages*. Apple River, Ill.: Apple River Press, 1976.

Ervin-Tripp, S. "Is Sybil there? The Structure of some American English Directives," *Language in Society* 5 (1976): 25–66.

Fries, Charles C. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Abor: The University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Furey, P. "A Framework for Cross-Cultural Analysis of Teaching Methods." Forthcoming.

Gattegno, Caleb. *Teaching Foreign Languages in Schools the Silent Way*. New York: Educational Solutions, second edition, 1972.

Gumperz, J.J. and D. Hymes, eds. "The Ethnography of Communication," *American Anthropologist* 66:6, part 2, 1964.

Gumperz, J.J. and D. Hymes, eds. *Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, 1972.

Hymes, D. "The Anthropology of Communication." In *Human Communication Theory*, ed. by F. Dance. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

_____. "Communicative Competence" in J.B. Pride and J. Holmes, ed., *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, pp. 269–93, 1972.

Jakobovits, L.A. "Prolegomena to a Theory of Communicative Competence," *Journal of English as a Second Language*, November, 1969.

Johnson, Francis C. *Teaching English as a Foreign Language in the Primary School: A Communicative Approach*. Hong Kong: Educational Publishing House, 1984.

Kelly, L.G. *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House. 1984.

Kuhn, T.S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Levin, L. *Implicit and Explicit: A Synopsis of Three Parallel Experiments in Applied Linguistics Assessing Different Methods of Teaching Grammatical Structures in English as a Foreign Language*. Gothenburg: School of Education, Research Bulletin #1, University of Gothenburg, 1969.

Lozanov, G. *Suggestology and Outlines of Suggestopedy*. New York: Gordan and Breach, 1979.

Moulton, W.G. "Linguistics and Language Teaching in the United States, 1940–1960," in *Trends in European and American Linguistics*, et al. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1961.

Munby, J. *Communicative Syllabus Design*. Cambridge, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Oller, J. and D.H. Obrecht. "Pattern Drill and Communicative Activity: A Psycholinguistic Experiment," *IRAL* 6:2 (1968): 165–72.

Paulston, C.B. "Structural Pattern Drills: A Classification," *Foreign Language Annals*, 4:2, 1970.

_____. "Linguistic and Communicative Competence," *TESOL Quarterly*, 8:4 (1974): 347–62.

_____. "Communicative Competence and Language Teaching," *Guidelines for Communication Activities*. Singapore: RELC, 1979.

_____. "Notional Syllabuses Revisited: Some Comments," *Applied Linguistics*, 2:1 (1981): 93–95.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prator, C. "In Search of a Method," in *Readings on English as a Second Language*, ed. K. Croft. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop, 1980.

Richards, J.C. and T. Rodgers. "Method: Approach, Design, and Procedure," *TESOL Quarterly*, 16:2 (1982): 153–68.

Richards, J.C. "The Secret Life of Methods," *Working Papers*, Department of English as a Second Language. University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2:2 (1983): 1–21.

Rintell, E. "Getting your Speech Act together: The Pragmatic Ability of Second Language Learners," *Working Papers on Bilingualism* 17 (1979): 97–106.

Rivers, W. "From Linguistic Competence to Communicative Competence," *TESOL Quarterly*, 7:1, 1973.

Rutherford, W. *Modern English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1968.

Savignon, S. "Study of the Effect of Training in Communicative Skills as Part of a Beginning College French Course on Student Attitude and Achievement in Linguistics and Communicative Competence." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1971.

_____. "Teaching for Communication," in E.G. Joiner and P.B. Westphals, eds. *Developing Communication Skills*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978.

_____. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. Reading, Mass.: AddisonWesley, 1983.

Scarcella, R. "On Speaking Politely in a Second Language." In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, and J. Schacter (eds.), *On TESOL '79*, Washington, D.C., TESOL, 1979.

Searle, J. "A Classification of Illocutionary Acts", *Language in Society* 5 (1976): 1–25.

Stevick, E.W. *Teaching Languages: A Way and Ways*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980.

Swain, M. "Communication Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development," MS, 1983.

Tikunoff, W.J. *Compatability of the SBIF Features with Other Research on Instruction for LEP Students*. Significant Bilingual Instructional Features Study. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education and San Francisco: Far West Laboratory, 1983.

Van Ek, J.A. *The Threshold Level of Modern Language Teaching in Schools*. Longmans, 1978.

Walters, J. "Strategies for Requesting in Spanish and English." *Language Learning*, 29 (1979): 277–93.

Wardhaugh, R. "TESOL: Current Problems and Classroom Practices," *TESOL Quarterly*, 3:2, 1969.

Widdowson, H.G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. London: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Wilkins, David. *Notional Syllabuses*. London: Oxford University Press, 1976.

Winitz, H. and J.A. Reeds. "Rapid Acquisition of a Foreign Language by Avoidance of Speaking," *IRAL*, 11:4 (1973): 295–317.

Wolfson, N. "Compliments in Cross-Cultural Perspective," *TESOL Quarterly*, 15:2 (1981): 117–24.

APPENDIX

Five Instructional Features

The five instructional features identified in Part I as significant for the instruction of LEP students are described as follows.

1. Successful teachers of LEP students exhibit a *congruence of instructional intent, organization and delivery of instruction, and student consequences*. They specify task outcomes and what students must do to accomplish tasks competently. In addition, they communicate (a) high expectations for LEP students in terms of learning, and (b) a sense of efficacy in terms of their own ability to teach.
2. Successful teachers of LEP students, like effective teachers generally, exhibit *use of "active teaching" behaviours* which have been found to be related to increase student performance on academic tests of achievement in reading and mathematics. These active teaching behaviours include (a) communicating clearly when giving directions, specifying tasks, and presenting new information — communication may involve such strategies as explaining, outlining, or demonstrating; (b) obtaining and maintaining students' engagement in instructional tasks by pacing instruction appropriately, promoting involvement, and communicating their expectations for students' success in completing instructional tasks; (c) monitoring students' progress and (d) providing immediate feedback whenever required regarding the students' success.
3. Successful teachers of LEP students mediate instruction for LEP students by the *use of the students' native language (L1) and English (L2) for instruction*, alternating between the two languages whenever necessary to ensure clarity of instruction for LEP students.
4. Successful teachers of LEP students mediate instruction for LEP students by the *integration of English language development with basic skills instruction*, focusing on LEP students acquiring English terms for concepts and lesson content even when L1 is used for a portion of the instruction.
5. Successful teachers of LEP students mediate instruction in a third way by the *use of information from the LEP students' home culture*. They (a) utilize cultural referents during instruc-

BEST COPY AVAILABL

tion, (b) organize instruction to build upon participant structures from the LEP students' home culture, and (c) observe the values and norms of the LEP students' home culture even as the norms of the majority culture are being taught.

Source: (Tikunoff, 1983: 6–7)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE